1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
2	WESTERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) Docket No. 1:07CR647
4	Plaintiff. ) Toledo, Ohio
5	v. ) July 12, 2010
6	ZUBAIR AND KHALEEL AHMED ) Sentencing
7	Defendants. )
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES G. CARR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	APPEARANCES:
12	For the Plaintiffs: Justin E. Herdman
13	Thomas E. Getz Office of the U.S. Attorney
14	801 Superior Avenue, W Suite 400
15	Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 622-3840
16	
17	AND
18	Gregory N. Sofer
19	Office of the U.S. Attorney 816 Congress Avenue
20	Austin, TX 78701 (512) 916-5854
21	AND
22	Jerome J. Teresinski
23	U.S. Department of Justice 10th & Constitution Avenue, NW
24	Washington, DC 20530 (202) 514-7146
25	

```
1
     For the Defendant, Zubair Ahmed:
                            Andrea L. Whitaker
 2
                            Terry H. Gilbert
                            Friedman & Gilbert
 3
                            600 Standard Building
                            Cleveland, Ohio 44113
                            (216) 241-1430
 4
 5
 6
     For the Defendant, Khaleel Ahmed:
                          Michael Slade
 7
                          Alyssa A. Qualls
                          Kirkland & Ellis
 8
                          300 North LaSalle Street
                          Chicago, IL 60654
 9
                          (312) 862-2000
10
11
     Court Reporter:
                          Angela D. Nixon, RPR, CRR
                           1716 Spielbusch Avenue
12
                           Toledo, Ohio 43624
                           (419) 260-5259
13
14
     Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
15
     produced by notereading.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
               COURTROOM DEPUTY: Case number 1:07CR647, United
     States of America versus Zubair Ahmed and case number
 3
 4
     07CR647, United States of America versus Khaleel Ahmed.
 5
     Matter's called for sentencing.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. Starting with the government
 7
     counsel, if you'll simply identify yourselves for the
 8
    record.
 9
              MR. HERDMAN: Justin Herdman for the United
10
     States.
11
              MR. SOFER: Greg Sofer for the United States.
                          Thomas Getz for the United States.
12
               MR. GETZ:
13
              MR. TERESINSKI: Good morning, Your Honor, Jerome
    Teresinski for the United States.
14
15
               THE COURT: And I believe a couple agents are
16
    here.
17
              MR. HERDMAN: Yes. Joseph Bertoldi from FBI
18
     Chicago and Shannon Coats from FBI Toledo.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. And for the defendants?
20
               MR. GILBERT: Terry Gilbert for Zubair Ahmed.
21
              MS. WHITAKER: Andrea Whitaker for Zubair Ahmed.
22
              MR. SLADE: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael
23
     Slade for Khaleel Ahmed.
24
               MS. QUALLS: And Alyssa Qualls for Khaleel.
25
               THE COURT: And also present is Ms. Myrna
```

```
Greenwood from pretrial service and probation office,
 1
 2
     although the office who prepared the report is not
 3
     available today, Shawna Sizemore.
               Mr. Herdman, you'll be speaking for the
 4
 5
     government?
 6
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Have you received and reviewed the
 8
     presentence reports?
 9
               MR. HERDMAN: I have for both defendants, Your
10
     Honor.
11
               THE COURT: And do you have any objections?
12
               MR. HERDMAN: I do not.
13
               THE COURT: And if not, are you prepared to
14
     proceed with sentencing?
15
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert?
               MR. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
17
18
               THE COURT: Have you received and reviewed the
     presentence report?
19
               MR. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor. We've received
20
21
     the presentence report, the original one, and we went over
22
     it very carefully with our client, Zubair Ahmed.
23
     Subsequently we sent a letter to the probation officer with
24
     some objections, which were duly noted in the final
25
     version.
```

```
Okay. And I will go through those in
 1
               THE COURT:
 2
     a moment. Mr. Ahmed, did you read the presentence report?
 3
               ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: Did you understand what it says and
 5
     what it means?
 6
               ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes, I do.
 7
               THE COURT: And don't want to know what you said
 8
     to Mr. Gilbert or he or may have said to you, but did you
     discuss it with him?
 9
10
               ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes.
               THE COURT: And did he take the time and give you
11
     the attention to answer all your questions?
12
13
               ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes, he did.
14
               THE COURT: And are you satisfied that you fully
15
     understand what the report says, and as I said, what it
16
     means?
17
               ZUBAIR AHMED: You mean do I understand it?
18
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
19
               ZUBAIR AHMED: I'm not satisfied with the report
20
    but I'm satisfied with the fact that I understood it.
21
               THE COURT: Now, with regard to dissatisfaction,
22
    has the dissatisfaction that you have, has that been
23
     communicated to me by your attorneys in their objections to
24
     the report?
25
               ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes, it has.
```

THE COURT: Okay. In other words, you're 1 2 satisfied with what they have done, but not with some 3 portions of the report; is that correct? 4 ZUBAIR AHMED: Yeah. 5 THE COURT: Now, your attorneys have represented 6 you for a long time in this proceeding, and I think from 7 the outset; is that correct? 8 MR. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: And Mr. Ahmed, are you satisfied with 10 the work that your lawyers have done for you and with you 11 throughout the entire course of these proceedings? 12 ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes, I am. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Have they given you enough 14 time and attention to make you feel confident that you and 15 they have been well prepared for everything that's happened 16 at every stage of these proceedings? ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes, sir. 17 18 Is there any way in which you are at THE COURT: 19 all dissatisfied with anything that they've done for you? 20 KHALEEL AHMED: Could you repeat that? 21 Is there any way that you are THE COURT: 22 dissatisfied or unhappy with anything that your two lawyers 23 have done for you? 24 KHALEEL AHMED: I am not dissatisfied. 25 Okay. Okay. And are you prepared THE COURT:

```
for sentencing today?
 1
 2
               ZUBAIR AHMED: Yes, I am, sir.
 3
               THE COURT:
                          Mr. Slade, likewise, have you
 4
     received and reviewed the presentence report?
 5
               MR. SLADE: Your Honor, similar to Mr. Gilbert,
 6
     we did receive an initial copy of the PSR. We sat down
 7
     with Khaleel and discussed it with him in some detail,
     communicated a number of objections of the probation
 8
     officer, some of which altered the report and others which
 9
     are noted at the end of the probation officer's report.
10
11
                          Did you discuss it with your client?
               THE COURT:
               MR. SLADE: Our office did discuss the PSR with
12
13
     Mr. Ahmed extensively, yes.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. And your office being
15
     co-counsel?
16
               MR. SLADE: One of my colleagues was the primary
17
     person discussing it with Mr. --
18
               THE COURT: And who was that, just for the
19
     record?
20
               MR. SLADE:
                          Alex Solotorovsky.
21
                          Mr. Ahmed, did you see a copy of the
               THE COURT:
22
     presentence report?
23
                               Yes, Your Honor.
               KHALEEL AHMED:
24
               THE COURT:
                           Did you read it?
25
                               Yes, sir.
               KHALEEL AHMED:
```

```
THE COURT: Did you understand what it says and
 1
     what it means?
 2
 3
               KHALEEL AHMED: I understood what it says.
 4
               THE COURT:
                          Did you have an opportunity to go
 5
     over the report with one or more attorneys representing
 6
     you?
 7
               KHALEEL AHMED:
                               Yes, I did.
 8
               THE COURT:
                           And did that lawyer take the time and
 9
     give you the attention sufficient to answer any questions
     you might have had about the presentence report?
10
11
                               Yes, they did, Your Honor.
               KHALEEL AHMED:
12
               THE COURT:
                          And are you satisfied with the
13
     lawyer -- lawyers have taken enough time to prepare you and
14
     them for sentencing today?
15
               KHALEEL AHMED: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT:
16
                          And as I asked your cousin, have your
17
     lawyers done so, in other words, have they taken the time
18
     and given you the attention in case -- the attention that
19
     you wanted them to give throughout the entire course of
20
     these proceedings?
21
                               Yes, that's fine.
               KHALEEL AHMED:
22
               THE COURT: And is there any way that you're not
23
     happy with what they've done with and for you in this case?
24
               KHALEEL AHMED:
                               I am satisfied with everything.
25
               THE COURT: You think that they've done all that
```

```
they can and do done so well on your behalf?
 1
 2
               KHALEEL AHMED: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. Mr. Slade, are there any
 4
     unresolved objections with regard to your client?
 5
               MR. SLADE:
                           Yes, Your Honor. Those are set forth
 6
     at the end of the probation officer's report.
 7
               THE COURT: Let's turn to those first. Looking
 8
     at page 23 of the report.
 9
               MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor --
10
               MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, are you referring to --
11
               THE COURT: I'm referring to Khaleel Ahmed.
12
               MR. SLADE: Your Honor, I believe the unresolved
13
     objections appear at the bottom of page 24.
14
               THE COURT:
                           Well, with regard to the first, I
15
     simply noted that, and I understand what you're saying
16
     that's on page 23. It's my understanding with regard to
17
     objection number one, the unresolved one that they have on
18
     page 24 is that basically the parties have agreed and
19
     stipulated in the plea agreement to the applicable
20
     sentencing quideline, applicable provision of sentencing
21
     guidelines and resulting base offense level computations.
22
     It's also my understanding that under Rule 11, 1(c)1, that
23
     I am bound by those agreements. Mr. Herdman, would you
24
     agree with that?
25
               MR. HERDMAN: I would, Your Honor.
```

```
Mr. Slade, would you agree with that?
 1
               THE COURT:
 2
               MR. SLADE:
                          I do, Judge, thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: So I will have to -- I will find that
 4
     the objection is well taken, and I will abide by the
 5
     computations as agreed to by the parties.
 6
               MR. SLADE: Your Honor, I believe it's the same
 7
     identical issue for objection two.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Herdman, likewise, is
 9
     that parties have agreed to essentially what the maximum
10
     term of supervised release is three years?
11
               MR. HERDMAN: That is what we agreed to.
12
               THE COURT: So it's your contention and
13
     representation that I am bound by that agreement --
14
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: -- between the parties? Okay.
16
     then it's my understanding the plea agreement between the
17
     parties is -- the total base offense level is 23, and the
18
     criminal history category was six; is that correct,
     Mr. Herdman?
19
20
               MR. HERDMAN: As for Khaleel Ahmed, yes.
               THE COURT: Yes, let's make that clear. And
21
22
     again, Mr. Slade, that's --
23
               MR. SLADE: Your Honor, that's correct.
                          Okay. And that would result in a
24
               THE COURT:
     advisory guideline range of 92 to 115 months; is that --
25
```

```
1
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes.
 2
              MR. SLADE: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
               MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, I should point out
 4
     that -- that base offense level envisions the triggering of
 5
     certain provisions within the plea agreement, motion by the
 6
     government as well.
 7
               THE COURT: I understand that. Okay. Are there
 8
     any other objections --
 9
               MR. SLADE:
                          None, Your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: -- unresolved.
11
               MR. SLADE: They're all set forth in the PSR.
12
               THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert and Mrs. Whitaker with
13
     Zubair Ahmed, I believe those objections begin on page 26?
14
               MR. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor. It's on our
15
              It's objection number three regarding the same
     report.
16
     issue of the guideline calculations.
17
               THE COURT: And obviously the same ruling.
18
              MR. GILBERT: Same ruling, and also objection
19
    number four is the term of supervised release.
20
                           Same situation, same ruling, correct?
               THE COURT:
21
              MR. GILBERT: Correct.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. And what else remains
23
    unresolved?
24
               MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, there are a number of
25
     relatively minor factual objections that are listed.
```

Starting at page 26? 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. GILBERT: Page 24. 3 THE COURT: Can I see your copy because mine's 4 number 26. Okay. I'm going to go through these one by 5 one, paragraph eight. 6 MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, let me just 7 preliminarily state that many of these objections are derived from a previous indictment in the manner that was 8 9 dismissed. And so when I went over the presentence report with my client, there were certain things that we felt that 10 11 were either inaccurate or there were competing versions 12 that nuances. For example, there was a firearm for example 1.3 that was --14 THE COURT: Paragraph eight? 15 MR. GILBERT: -- purchased after -- after he was 16 already represented by counsel in this matter in Chicago. 17 And it was returned, and it was -- we don't really believe 18 it had anything to do with this case. 19 We also believe that there was references to 20 steroids, somehow that was alleged to have been part of the 21 bearing on the conspiracy of the plan. Zubair had been a 2.2 body builder, or he had been into exercise and he had done 23 this notwithstanding whatever allegations were in this 24 case. Going to the shooting range, he went with friends 25 that were not part of this case for a day of recreation.

mean, can it be used as evidence in a trial? Probably.

But he wanted me to indicate that there were other reasons for it as well. And since this report goes to the Bureau of Prisons, we wanted to at least reflect that there was some alternative notions with respect to those allegations. But once again, they did come from a charging instrument that had been dismissed. And we believe that the factual basis of the plea agreement should really form the nucleus of facts in this case.

MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, can I just respond?

THE COURT: If I may, those are principally, it seems, recitations of the indictment which, candidly, is not particularly helpful. Here I am, and here he is.

MR. HERDMAN: And I think the indictment has not been dismissed yet. It was to be dismissed on the date of sentencing, so it is still a superceding indictment that forms the basis. It was the initial indictment in this 647 case that has not been dismissed yet, and so therefore, the document's still, I would say, relevant, however helpful it may or may not be.

THE COURT: My inclination, I'll go through this one by one, but my inclination in situations like this, I'm not going to pay any attention to whatever misinformation or misinterpretation you find bothersome, won't play a role in my sentence.

MR. GILBERT: I understand. And we felt -- we felt compelled to put this in our objections. I mean, there was some references to certain, like, suicide vest construction which he had nothing to do with. Some of this information might have applied to other previous co-defendants and things like that. And if you read this, it might look like he's worse than he really is. And so I think it needs to be put into prospective. It's in there. It's noted. The Court can disregard it as it's indicated and that's fine.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me go through these. To the extent it has any bearing with regard to the attempt to purchase a firearm, and I'll accept the representation that there's legitimate purposes for doing so. And in any event, I'm not going to pay any attention to that statement. The challenge -- same, I will take cognizance of the objection or statement in paragraph 9 that training and so forth, it's not exclusively geared towards engaging in Jihad, and I will accept that representation, and I will disregard any suggestion to the contrary.

The same, I will with regard to paragraph 10, I will simply base my sentence on the understanding that that activity had nothing to do with preparing for Jihad.

And I will accept paragraph 11 as an accurate representation of the situation and disregard anything to

the contrary.

Likewise with paragraph 18.

And I will also accept the representation as being accurate in paragraph 21 and disregard any suggestion to the contrary to PSI.

MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, I apologize. I'm just trying to clarify with respect to the findings that you're making right now, these are essentially -- my understanding what you're doing is that you are essentially saying your sentence is not going to rely on the facts for the objections that have been noted with respect to these particular paragraphs that are in the indictment, which the government will concede that is not all that helpful --

THE COURT: That's correct.

MR. HERDMAN: -- in finding a factual -- the factual findings you have to make with respect to sentence. But we obviously -- we have a different take on the facts as they were --

THE COURT: The problem is, the only facts that I've got from the government are the recitation in the indictment. And to resolve these with factual findings as to which is true and which is not true, I would have to sit down and conduct a series of hearings, take evidence, and make a ruling, and I'm not about to do that.

MR. HERDMAN: Nor are we.

THE COURT: I'm simply saying, given the fact that all I have from the government is the indictment, I'm going to favor the defendant by accepting his representations. And where they conflict, I will accept his representations as accurate and will disregard anything -- any assertion of fact or inference to the contrary that may be found in the indictment. The indictment's just a charging instrument. It's not proof of anything.

MR. HERDMAN: And we also do intend, Your Honor, to rely on the facts that were in the sentencing memorandum which were submitted which were a little more descriptive with respect to the conduct of the offense.

THE COURT: I understand. But I believe under the guidelines, when confronted with objections that would apply to a great deal of time and taking of testimony to resolve them, and these would, and wind up having a week or two's worth of trial, a week or three or four days or whatever doesn't seem to make any sense because I don't think any of them really ultimately are material or will have any effect on my sentence one way or another.

MR. HERDMAN: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: What matters to me is what is contained in the plea agreement. Certainly with regard to paragraph 22 and 23, paragraphs 22 and 23, that's my

recollection of the evidence, that at one point after the 1 2 initial contact between the Ahmed cousins and Mr. El-Hindi 3 and others, they kind of wandered away and, despite the 4 urgings of the government's agent, no further contact was 5 had, is that correct, Mr. Gilbert? That's my recollection. 6 MR. GILBERT: There was a possibility of having 7 further contact, but it never materialized. 8 It never materialized. THE COURT: 9 There was a telephone call, Your MR. HERDMAN: Honor, which was pointed out in the sentencing memorandum, 10 11 but there was no face-to-face contact. THE COURT: 12 Right. There were no specific 13 arrangements to meet, and there was no firearm instruction 14 on July 4th. There was some talk about weapons and 15 shooting machine guns and all that. Okay. 16 Paragraph 36 I'll accept that as accurate. 17 Paragraphs 37, 38, 39, once again, I'll accept 18 that there were a variety of subject matters, including 19 those which were entirely innocent and had nothing to do 20 with Jihad. There was -- and I think paragraph 45 is 21 correct. Isn't that what the evidence showed, that is the 22 only individual who's with Zubair Ahmed at the convention 23 in Cleveland and was part of the conspiracy is 24 Mr. El-Hindi, that's correct? 25 MR. HERDMAN: Other than Mr. Griffin?

```
That's right.
 1
               THE COURT:
 2
               MR. GILBERT: I didn't count him.
 3
               MR. HERDMAN: And Khaleel Ahmed was there as
 4
     well.
                           I understand, but he never met
 5
               THE COURT:
 6
    Mr. Mazloum or Mr. Amawi.
 7
               MR. HERDMAN: No.
 8
               THE COURT:
                          That's correct. I'm going to accept,
 9
     as I think I already have, the representation that the
10
     purpose was lawful and legitimate for purchasing or trying
11
     to purchase a firearm. I think it's also fair to at least
12
     have a sense that whatever experience he may have gained
     with that, had he, in fact, gained much in the way of
13
14
     experience might the fact that the endeavor which brings us
15
     here, but certainly I accept the fact and representation
16
     that ab initio the purchase was for legitimate purchase.
17
               Mr. Gilbert, does that all satisfactorily resolve
18
     your objections? If not, let me know.
19
               MR. GILBERT: There is 53, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT:
                          I'm sorry. Okay. I'm going to
21
     accept the accuracy of that --
               MR. GILBERT: That would then --
22
23
               THE COURT: -- representation.
24
               MR. GILBERT: That would then conclude our
25
     objections.
```

MR. HERDMAN: If I may interject, I was playing 1 2 catch up there, I apologize. With respect to paragraph 23, 3 I did just want to point out that the defendants, in their 4 plea agreement, conceded with respect to the facts that 5 they did receive firearms instructions on July 4th, 2004 6 from Darren Griffin. 7 THE COURT: Well, if that's in the agreement, 8 then that's binding and I can't change it. I will abide by whatever the agreement says. And my recollection, and 9 there was a fair amount at trial about that was that they 10 certainly didn't, you know -- I don't think there were any 11 12 weapons displayed. 13 MR. HERDMAN: It was much more nuance 14 instruction, Your Honor, and I can explain that if --15 MR. GILBERT: It depends how you define 16 instruction. 17 MR. SLADE: Your Honor, I think you're right that 18 the entirety of the conversation that the government's 19 talking about, we're talking about, and you're talking 20 about was viewed during the Amawi trial a number of times, 21 so I think everybody knows what was said and what wasn't 22 said during that conversation. 23 THE COURT: I'll tell you what, I'm going to 24 interpret the parties' agreement as binding me to the

evidence that was produced in that regard with the Amawi

25

```
trial.
 1
               MR. GILBERT: Thank you.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. Herdman and Mr. Gilbert, does
 4
     that resolve the objections, and does it do so in a way
 5
     that is satisfactory to both of you?
 6
               MR. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor, from the
 7
     standpoint of Mr. Zubair Ahmed.
 8
               MR. HERDMAN: And same here.
 9
               THE COURT: And Mr. Slade, likewise, and
10
     Mr. Herdman, with regard to the objections on behalf of
11
     Khaleel Ahmed?
12
               MR. SLADE:
                          We're prepared for sentencing, yes.
13
               THE COURT: But you're content with my resolution
14
     of the objections?
15
               MR. SLADE:
                          We are.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Herdman?
17
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor, given the
18
     clarification. Thank you.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Let's hear from Mr. Herdman
20
     first with regard to Zubair Ahmed.
21
               MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, do you want to handle
22
     the government's motions at this point in time, or do you
23
     want to wait until --
24
               THE COURT: I think so. I mean, at least in
25
     terms of the 5(K) motion, I think it's appropriate to be
```

```
It's my practice, any dismissal motions in the
 1
 2
     indictment or whatever come at the end after sentence has
 3
     been pronounced.
 4
               MR. HERDMAN: With respect to Zubair Ahmed, Your
 5
     Honor, the government is prepared, and does at this point
 6
     in time, move under U.S. Sentencing Guideline 5(K) for a
 7
     departure of 13 levels off the -- in accordance with the
    plea agreement. So that would bring the offense level down
 8
 9
     to a 27. And government would also move at this point in
10
     time under the quidelines with respect to acceptance of
     responsibility and acknowledge Zubair Ahmed's acceptance of
11
12
     responsibility.
13
               THE COURT:
                           I don't think Mr. -- excuse me, and
14
     of course that motion will be granted. And I don't think
15
     that I -- I certainly should, that on granting of that
16
     motion, that results in a total offense level of 24,
17
     criminal history category of 6; is that correct?
18
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: And that results in a guideline range
20
     of about 100 to 125 months; is that correct?
21
               MR. HERDMAN:
                            Yes.
22
               MR. GILBERT: That's correct.
23
               THE COURT: Give me one second.
                                                Okay.
24
     Mr. Herdman --
25
               MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, the government is
```

recommending and requesting a sentence of 120 months 1 2 imprisonment as to Zubair Ahmed. And much of what I have 3 to say goes to both defendants, but in terms of the conduct 4 in this case, which is really government's position --5 THE COURT: And let me just, before you go any 6 further, let me just -- I apologize for interrupting, but I 7 just want the record to be clear that there is nothing in 8 the plea agreement that restricts your ability to make 9 whatever recommendation you want to, provided it is within 10 the quideline range. 11 MR. HERDMAN: That's correct, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert; is that correct? MR. GILBERT: That is correct. 13 14 THE COURT: Which is no breach of the agreement 15 that's occurring because the government is not remaining 16 silent. 17 MR. GILBERT: We agree. THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 18 19 The nature and circumstance of the MR. HERDMAN: 20 offense in this case are of the highest severity, Your 21 Honor. As the plea agreement sets out, as the facts that 22 were stipulated to both parties in the agreement sets out, 23 these defendants, and especially Zubair Ahmed, over the 24 course of years, this was not a case where it was, I know 25 it's been tried, defense counsel at times characterized it

```
as sort of a fleeing decision to travel overseas or a
 1
 2
     one --
 3
               THE COURT: Yeah, but it was a very deliberate
 4
     decision. And the objective of what but for the
 5
     interception by Mr. El-Hindi and the father of one of the
 6
     defendants in Cairo would have been accomplished.
 7
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I don't want to
 8
    qo too far --
 9
               THE COURT: Who knows what would have happened
10
     after that. But on the other hand, the venture would have
11
     continued.
12
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: And it was a venture that obviously
14
    had a dangerous and deadly --
15
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes.
16
               THE COURT: And it was a venture that was
17
    deliberately undertaken.
18
               MR. HERDMAN: And the intent was to kill members
     of the United States military.
19
20
               THE COURT: I think that's undisputed.
21
               MR. HERDMAN: And as you correctly pointed out,
22
     this was a decision to travel overseas that did not just
23
     arise instantly. It required planning. And it required
24
     discussions.
               THE COURT: And also it is not one to which
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

either defendant can point and say take Darren Griffin out of it and there's no -- as Mr. Hartman said on behalf of his client.

MR. HERDMAN: That's exactly right. defendants independently came to this decision. Marwan El-Hindi went over in Cairo, brought them back to the United States, and instead of giving up on this ambition to engage in violent Jihad against members of the U.S. military, these defendants went and met with Darren Griffin, a self-avowed extremist, a former member of the U.S. military who did provide firearms instruction on July 4th. And it was very nuance, as I said, but I think it's important that The Court take that into account because in that July 4th conversation, Darren Griffin told Zubair and Khaleel Ahmed that they should start training with a .22 caliber handgun, that's how they should begin their training. That was July 4th, 2004, Your Honor. months later in February of 2006, Zubair Ahmed and Khaleel Ahmed discuss the fact that Darren Griffin had brought up the .22 caliber handgun when they were discussing amongst themselves what handgun they should purchase. And Zubair Ahmed is the one who recollected the fact that Darren Griffin had told them to start off with a .22 caliber So that -- the reason the government felt it was so important to point out there was instruction provided to

2.2

the defendants on July 4th because that, in fact, kept it in the recesses of their mind and pulled it out at a very crucial moment. And the date of that telephone, Your Honor, was actually the same date that in Toledo Marwan El-Hindi was being arrested. The defendants did not know at that point in time he was being arrested. It was coincidence, but that's the same day that they discussed it. After the arrest of Marwan El-Hindi, obviously the defendants changed at least the overt acts they were taking with respect to violent Jihad.

But to get back to the July 4th meeting, it was important, and I think the government would have to concede on some level that the defendants didn't meet up with Darren Griffin, and they didn't continue their discussions with Marwan El-Hindi. And the government's position is that they did that because the only people they could trust were each other, and to some extent Syed Haris Ahmed, who was down in Atlanta. And that gives rise to the reason why these defendants are being charged in a separate case. It was very apparent as we, the government, reviewed the evidence that you've considered in the Amawi trial, that these defendants were separate conspirators.

THE COURT: There was a linkage.

MR. HERDMAN: Two separate conspiracies that touched maybe over a period of time, but the defendants

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

went on in their own separate conspiracy, and they did not give up this Jihadist ambition. Zubair Ahmed, as you may recall from the July 4th meeting with Darren Griffin, discussed a five-year plan, and that's set out in the But this five-year plan encompassed a number of different steps that would have to be taken. Culmination of a five-year plan was to engage in violent Jihad overseas, at least go overseas and put themselves in a position where they could realize these violent Jihad. The interaction with Syed Haris Ahmed is pointed out in the plea agreement and is very crucial with respect to the fact that these defendants -- Zubair Ahmed was the defendant who had the most contact with Syed Hair Ahmed -- but these defendants sought out, like, younger individuals, in fact, who were putting themselves in position to go overseas and engage in the exact same type of activities that the defendants wished to engage in. And Zubair Ahmed's interaction with Syed Haris Ahmed was quite extensive, and it lasted at least up until the arrest of Marwan El-Hindi, and probably a little bit after that as well. Syed Ahmed was arrested in the spring of 2006

Syed Ahmed was arrested in the spring of 2006 following the arrest in the Amawi case. But this was over the course of several years Zubair Ahmed cultivated this relationship with Syed Haris Ahmed. And the whole purpose of it was to go overseas and to engage in violent actions

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

against members of the U.S. military or to engage in Jihad.

I did want to just briefly address this purchase of the handgun in the fall of 2006. As the plea agreement makes clear, defendants, throughout the course of the conspiracy, used code words. They frequently spoke in a foreign language, Urdu, which is a less commonly spoken language, and they did that with the intent to evade government surveillance. And the handgun, I will concede, could have had some legitimate purpose to it; however, these defendants discussed that handgun purchase using code words. And there may be legitimate purposes just like there may be legitimate purposes for going to the shooting range, but I would submit all this activity was geared, even after the arrest of Marwan El-Hindi, all of it was geared toward the possibility of fulfilling this conspiracy that these 12 defendants had arrived at together, which was to go overseas and kill members of the U.S. military.

And finally, as the sentencing memorandum makes clear upon the arrest of Zubair Ahmed -- I'm sorry,

February of 2007, there was an external hard drive that was seized that contained a number of manuals that related to small arms, weaponry, videos that related to Jihadist attacks as well as some literature on Jihad, some ideological prospectives with Jihad, all of which would be important, all of which were in this external portable hard

drive.

2.2

So to get back to the nature and circumstances with which I think is where this is, where the government's argument essentially lies, Your Honor, is that this is the highest severity. These were defendants who agreed and over the course of several years set out to go overseas and kill members of the U.S. military. That was their intent. That was their objective. Defense counsel in their sentencing memorandum, as I read them, tried to compare this case to that of Wassim Masloum. I'm sure that you read that. And I can understand why they did that.

THE COURT: I will hear from them, but I understand what you're saying. I intend to go -- on that. But Masloum was obviously the least engaged and did the most kind of wonder away, and so far, as anybody knows, had nothing to do with -- anything to do with whatever may have been on his mind. There was communication with Mr. Griffin, Mr. Amawi and Mr. El-Hindi. I can't remember if he was with all three. I just don't recall. The impression I got from Mr. Masloum is he went about the business of selling cars and going to school.

MR. HERDMAN: That's correct. And I --

THE COURT: So far as we know.

MR. HERDMAN: I don't want to rehash all of the Masloum argument, but generally what I would say is this,

and I think that, Your Honor, when you actually 1 2 sentenced --3 THE COURT: Time out. I can see a similarity 4 vis-a-vis meeting in Cleveland and then Griffin kept 5 saying, well, what about the boys in Chicago, we've got to 6 get in touch with them. Nothing happened. But quite 7 candidly at this point, that's the extent of any 8 similarity. 9 MR. HERDMAN: What I was going to say, Your 10 Honor, is during the sentencing of Mr. Mazloum, I think you 11 pointed out to the fact, which is in stark contrast to what these defendants did, the way you put it -- if you'll give 12 13 me just a moment I want to read this into the record --14 that with respect to Mr. Masloum and his activity, you said 15 just as quickly and brilliantly as that flame flared up, I 16 truly believed that it was extinguished or certainly 17 flickered and has flared out. And without making any 18 concessions as to whether or not that is the case with 19 Masloum or that's the government's position with Masloum, I 20 think these defendants are in stark contrast to that 21 statement that you made about Mr. Masloum -- Mr. Masloum's 22 activity in that other conspiracy --23 THE COURT: Things continue to glow. 24 MR. HERDMAN: Yes, the ambers were more than

ambers, it was a flame and it burned for several years with

25

respect to Zubair and Khaleel Ahmed.

2.2

The other point I wanted to make with respect to Mr. Masloum, this is a more subtle point. He is not a U.S. citizen, and I know that was a factor that you considered in sentencing Mr. Masloum. Both of these defendants are citizens. Overall, that is an entirely separate case and entirely different conduct. As similar as they may be, I think, as you pointed out, the closest interaction is the extent of the interaction with Darren Griffin. But with respect to the planning that these defendants did and the conspiracy that existed between these two defendants, it's an entirely different matter, I would submit.

And the plea agreements also set out, Your Honor, that there is -- Zubair Ahmed is at a different level with respect to his offense conduct. He's at a 24 as opposed to Ahmed's at a 34. And that is just another factor that I think goes into this and into the sentencing decision on what to make.

However, the primary factor is the nature and circumstances of the offense. Zubair Ahmed is obviously a very capable individual. He's attended numerous educational instructions. He had a number of options and opportunities available to him, and the one he elected and felt compelled to engage in is Jihad as opposed to legitimate business opportunities. He wanted to engage in

2.2

violent Jihad overseas and kill members of the U.S. military. For that reason I realize that the guideline range we're working with here is a difference of about 25 months from the lowest end to the highest end. But based on the severity of the conduct, based on the opportunities that were given to this defendant throughout his life and I think all of the materials that have been submitted to The Court would suggest that this was a person who had significant opportunity, the choice that he made and the crime that he committed, all of them lean themselves of a recommendation of 121 months in this particular sentence.

THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert?

MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, obviously we have a number of areas to go into today. First of all, I want to indicate to The Court that Zubair's family is here today. His father, his mother, his sister Jasmine, who just graduated from medical school in Europe, his younger sister Sammy. They have been staunch, emotional and physical support for him from day one in this process.

This process, as you indicated, has gone on for three years, over three years actually. And I remember the first time we met in this courtroom. There was somewhat of a contentious debate over whether or not these two young men would be released on bond. The Court was able to see the roots that my client has in the community of Chicago,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

not only in terms of his family but extended family, friends, his educational activities, his work history, et cetera. You took a gamble back then as far as in a case of this nature which, you know, creates a lot of emotion in the community and the public at large. You took a gamble on allowing them to be released on home detention. And that gamble proved that what you had hoped would occur in terms of their allegiance and accommodating the probation pretrial services, et cetera, that it wasn't -- it could have been easier just to put them in pretrial detention. But they continued, my client continued to look forward and not backward. He just didn't waste his time sitting in a house. He continued his education, continued to help around with his family, provide the support for his mother, and worked on a masters degree all this time, and actually hoped to have been married by this point, but he -- and that's why he stayed out, by the way, Your Honor, and didn't self surrender earlier. He could have had a significant period of time behind him.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MR. GILBERT: So I wanted The Court to know that. We would ask The Court to impose the minimum. I'm sure that's not a surprise to you. We really feel that that is more than adequate to serve the principles and philosophy of sentencing in this case. We know there are no criminal

history points here, but for this unfortunate series of acts and circumstances. Here was a young man who exemplified good behavior in the community. And I don't want to dwell on all the facts of the case, and I certainly don't want to throw up a defense at this point to his behavior. He has pled guilty, acknowledged his role. You read the statement that he gave to the probation officer where essentially he has come to grips with the fact that his thinking process in the years 2004, 2005 and going into 2006, was completely wrong, full hearted, distorted. And if there was anything that he could do more to show his regret and remorse and to atone for what he did back then, he would do it. There's nothing more that he can do to demonstrate to The Court more than what he's already done.

You know, I know the government's position in here was this was a dangerous, well-thought-out conspiracy, that had it continued would have caused unknown harm and perhaps death to American soldiers. And certainly that was the intent. I don't dispute that for one moment. But the plan is different than the intent, and the actions, while indicative of the intent, did not play out in a way that was sophisticated or developed to an extent that it might have gone the way the government thought it would go. I mean, you have -- you have a couple of young guys here who basically bought into this idea of Jihad because of their

2

3

5

6

7

8

25

```
naivety. You've got to remember, 2003, 2004 is not today
              They are not the same people. They were
     youngsters back then, essentially. They started
 4
     legitimately studying Islam to further their knowledge of
     their religion, and they were not raised this way.
     came from families that bought into the American dream who
     gave their --
               THE COURT: And have, if I understand correctly,
 9
     otherwise prospered in various ways.
10
              MR. GILBERT: Prospered. The father and the
11
     mother came over from India and Pakistan with nothing,
12
     working jobs, selling hot dogs on the street, building up
13
     some money to eventually get into a business, finishing the
14
     education. This is the kind of values they instilled on
15
     Zubair. And Zubair essentially took up that call and went
16
     to school. He went to a catholic school. He went to
17
     various colleges, he worked. There is more to him than the
18
     indictment or the information or the presentence report
19
     account of what he did.
20
               THE COURT: Yes, but of course it's that aspect
21
     of him that brings us here. I understand.
22
              MR. GILBERT: That's right. So I guess what
     we're arguing about here, or not arguing but --
23
24
               THE COURT: No, what you're --
              MR. GILBERT: -- discussing.
```

THE COURT: One is trying to push me up and the other is trying to pull me down in terms of the range. I understand.

MR. GILBERT: They decide, okay, we're going to go to Egypt, and maybe we'll find somebody that will help us get into Pakistan. I mean, they had no contacts with any organization or any specific individual who was a member of an insurgent group or terrorist organization.

THE COURT: A little like me going to Belfast and raising my hand or going to London and raising my hand for a trip to --

MR. GILBERT: They go to a travel agency, they buy tickets, and they hide this from their parents, and the day after they wound up not being at home, their mother's on the phone. They go to the Chicago Police Department and enter a missing person's report. They're still under the auspices of their parents at this stage. And of course because of this family integrity, it didn't take long to find them. It didn't take long to find out that they were halfway around the world in a city of multi-millions of people and find them within a few days. And on one hand you could say, well, but for that, you know, ability to get them out, they would have continued. Who knows where they would have gone. But it was a far cry from Islamabad or the western region of Pakistan. I mean, to get to a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

terrorist camp and all that, I mean, we can argue back and forth how possible that would have been, but nonetheless, that was their intent. There's no question about it. it was an ill-conceived venture. And they did not put up a fight when Mr. Ahmed showed up with Marwan El-Hindi and Youseff, the one that came from the medical school in They spent the next week or so touring -- as Slovakia. tourists riding camels. We have pictures of that and that kind of thing, and then they came home. And you know, unfortunately they should have just stopped right there. You know what I mean? If we had our way about it looking back, that's what we would have hoped they have done. But I just want to make a comment on the July 4th ICNA conference. As far as I understand, they went to this conference to promote the medical school in Slovakia that Marwan's brother was sponsoring and trying to recruit students. This is -- this ICNA conference was a public conference, open, not some secret meeting. THE COURT: It wasn't the cell? MR. GILBERT: It wasn't the cell in some safe They -- they were there for the legitimate purpose. house. Mr. Herdman, you know, kind of made it look like they went there to meet with the trainer. The trainer idea came about as they were in the process of going or getting

there. And in fact, they didn't meet him the first day.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They actually met him in an innocuous meeting, and then it wasn't until I think the day afterwards that they actually had this 20-minute conversation about training, and you know the details.

THE COURT: Sure, I saw the pictures.

MR. GILBERT: And beyond that, beyond that trip to Egypt, nothing really materialized in terms of actual acts other than communication from that point on. either all Internet interactions with each other, phone conversations with each other and Internet and phone --Internet actions with Syed Haris who wanted Zubair and Khaleel, I guess, to go meet him either in Georgia. And Syed Haris went off and did all kinds of bad things during that period, but Zubair never joined him. It was just talk, and there was a lot of talk about many things that young people talk about, family, education, games, things like that. I mean, it wasn't just only during that period about, you know, Jihad. And yes, there was talk about a five-year plan. But when you look at this case, the totality of the circumstances, you have a period of time where there were multiple interests that Zubair had, one of which was the idea of engaging in Jihad, but it never got too far.

And, you know, as a defense lawyer, I look at the guidelines, I look at these numbers, and I see they're just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

off the charts. And when you really look at this individual and see that at this point in life, the opportunities and the potential that he has, how much punishment is really needed to do the things that are necessary to satisfy the purposes of sentencing as well as to give them a chance to be a productive member of society. He did get one point more than Khaleel, and I actually think that the two of them were in this together for the most part. As cousins they've known each other, or just that Zubair has better command of the language, has more education. THE COURT: Actually, they became acquainted at a wedding or something. MR. GILBERT: Pardon? I thought they had become acquainted THE COURT: at a wedding. In other words, they hadn't really known each other on a life-long basis, am I wrong about that? Your Honor, they had met once at a MR. SLADE: family wedding prior to Khaleel's arrival in the U.S. THE COURT: Right. MR. GILBERT: But what I mean in the relative time period, they were very close. THE COURT: I understand. MR. GILBERT: And I think they were in this together. The government wanted to have Zubair to have an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

extra point, and obviously we didn't object to it. But I think extra point more than adequately suffices and substantiates a low -- the lowest range because he is getting more time than Khaleel. But in truth, and I'm not saying this to any way suggest that Khaleel should get more time, but I just think that Zubair is taking a burden on a debatable point. I mean, he really was more communicative, but in terms of actions, I don't think they would even disagree that they were in this together. And that's an eight-month bump, Your Honor, between Zubair and Khaleel in terms of the minimum. I believe Khaleel's getting a 92 month minimum possibility, and Zubair's at 100 month minimum possibility. And I just think that when the government, we negotiated this plea agreement over a long period of time. It was a very difficult process to get to where we're at today. And we were hoping, frankly, that we wouldn't have to go through a sentencing hearing like we are today, that the government would simply say, well, you know, we are willing to go to -- agree to 100 -- to 125 range, given the 5(K)1, given all the things that he's done, you know, the proffers, et cetera, no record, circumstances of the case kind of being somewhat out of the heartland of normal terrorist cases that we see, that they would just simply say we'll go along with 100. Obviously they can't object to this if it's the 100 months.

would ask The Court, because of the things that we've said, to impose a 100 month sentence. That's a long period of time for a young man of his age. He'll be close -- probably be close to 40 when he gets out. He -- every month would make a big difference, and it seems to me that it would be appropriate under the circumstances given the totality of the situation here to give him 100 months as the sentence. I think that would be more than sufficient. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Ahmed, you may speak on your own behalf before I pronounce sentence.

ZUBAIR AHMED: Your Honor, I'd like to, first of all, thank you for letting me speak on my own behalf, though my lawyers were speaking on my behalf, but currently I'm just speaking to you face-to-face. I'd like to start off by apologizing for my previous ambitions -- my actions, which were totally wrong. The thing was that I was caught up in the world events, and what I was thinking at the time was that the path to violence would somehow help my nation, which is the Muslims, from getting their freedoms stripped. I thought by getting caught up in the violent idealogy would somehow gain beneficial gains, but if we look at history, very recently we see Hamed Hacbani (phonetic) practiced non-violence, and his whole movement was founded on non-violence and we see the fruits of that today. What

we see today is India, which is a viable democracy. I believe it's the world's largest -- we see a multitude of cultures and religions there, and everybody gets to practice their religion, and people are basically living in piece. And he did it through non-violence, and it accomplished a lot. And that's a good example for me to follow. And I was thinking about that while under house arrest and while this whole case was unfolding.

And another thing I'd like to say is that, I mean, my actions did produce a lot of harm for my family. They're the only ones right now that are there for me, and the fact that I'm not physically there for them and that, you know, that hurts them, and it's going to continue to hurt because of my actions, which I shouldn't have done.

And as I heard him say, I did have opportunities which I did engage in. I was better off, I was from middle class family, I had educational better, I did choose a different path which I shouldn't have chosen. Currently I have no Jihad mission, nor will I in the future, and that is not the case now.

Another thing is a year after I came back from

Egypt I met my fiancee, and she's still there for me in a

sense that I couldn't get married due to a myriad of

reasons which I'm not going to bring up in court, but she's

still there, and she said she's going to wait for me when I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

get out and we are corresponding with each other. unfortunately she didn't know -- I mean, well, fortunately she didn't know about my previous ambition, but what happened was my past caught up with me, and when I got arrested she just got thrown into that, what I would say holding a pot of water. And she too had to suffer because of my previous actions. And I think that's totally unfair. And I told her to leave me, and you didn't know about this, but I'm done with that. I want to marry you and have a family, and I was quite candid in that. But despite that fact, she still has decided to stand by me, and I owe it to her too to be a model citizen, to give back to the United States of America to be a good citizen and by completely abolishing any type of violent idealogy, bringing harm to any citizen or any U.S. service men or any human being. I mean, there are a lot of aspects which I can't continue to follow which have nothing to do with violence. There's, for a whole multitude of things I can do, and I did pick up these things while under house arrest. been working with other individuals, while I'm in prison I'm going to continue to follow that work, which is basically give no harm to any human being, and basically all governments will be happy. Also my choice that I made previously would have put myself into direct conflict with

U.S. traps which is completely wrong, and that's something

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that would hurt my fellow countrymen. At that time I was looking at U.S. troops as my enemy but I shouldn't have. You know, they were also my country. And I can still be a Muslim and an American citizen simultaneously. At that point I thought there's only one thing I can be, a Muslim. And like Busch said, you are with us or against us. At that point I was, like, man, I'm with them but now it's not that case. I had, like my counsel said, I was more naive. At that point I thought that a lot of things would be happening because of the violence that would culminate into more positive things for Muslim people. But exact opposite of that happened. There's just more violence, more hate, and basically no issues are being resolved both on the American side and Muslim side. So regarding that, I think that's all I have to say. Once again, I'd like to apologize for my actions. I'd like to thank the government for working with counsel and to coming up with this range. And I'd like to apologize to my family, the American government, the American people and the U.S. service men. And I'd like to thank you for listening to my statement. THE COURT: Mr. Herdman, anything further? MR. HERDMAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor? THE COURT: Anything further from the government? MR. HERDMAN: No. I'm comfortable resting on my

1 previous statement. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert, anything further on 3 behalf of your client? 4 MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, did you want to have a 5 side bar on the other memo that we filed regarding the 6 5(K)1, or did you hear enough? 7 THE COURT: I'm quite comfortable. 8 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Thank you. 9 THE COURT: It's not my practice to put anything 10 of that regard on the record. And I think I've been 11 adequately informed throughout the course of these 12 proceedings. I think I was made aware fairly early on of 13 what some of the activities were that were contemplated and 14 the extent to which they've been carried out. I'm going to 15 accept the government's recommendation, and I'll explain 16 why shortly. 17 Formally to pronounce sentence, pursuant to the 18 Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and 18 U.S. Code, Section 19 3553(A), it's the judgment of this court that defendant, 20 Zubair Ahmed, be and hereby is committed to the custody of 21 the bureau of prisons to be in prison for a term of 120 22 months. Upon release from imprisonment, defendant shall be 23 placed on supervised release for three years which is the 24 maximum term. Within 72 hours of release from the custody

of the Bureau of Prisons, you shall report in person to

25

United States pretrial service and probation office in this district or in the district in which he is released. No fine will be imposed. There will be a special assessment of \$100 which is due immediately. That's payable -- does he have that money, the special assessment? If not it will be taken from his prison earnings, or if the family can pay for it, that's fine.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, shall not illegally possess a controlled substance, shall comply with the standard conditions adopted by this Court and following any additional conditions. There's no substance abuse background, is there?

MR. GILBERT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I will waive the drug testing requirement. And that's not part of the plea agreement, I take it?

MR. GILBERT: No.

THE COURT: Defendant shall not possess a firearm, destructive device or dangerous weapon. He shall submit his person, residence, place of business, computer, vehicle to a warrantless search, conducted and controlled by the U.S. probation officer at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based on reasonable suspicion of contraband. Evidence of failure to submit to such a search

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

will be grounds for revocation. The defendant shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this provision and shall provide the probation officer with access to any and all requested financial information, shall undertake diligently to seek, and if he seeks to diligently maintain lawful, gainful employment. He shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation office. Does any party have any objection to any part of these proceedings that's not previously been made? MR. HERDMAN: Not from the government. MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, I had neglected to make this request in our sentencing memorandum. We had asked

that The Court to recommend Oxford Correctional Facility or Institution in Wisconsin.

THE COURT: I'll make that recommendation.

MR. GILBERT: And there's a medium security prison there because it has educational opportunities so on and so forth.

THE COURT: As you're well aware, I have no control or ultimately even influence over those decisions, it's entirely up to the Bureau of Prisons. It would be my anticipation or hunch that given the label that's attached to the conviction and enhancement and criminal history category that flows from all that, that may not be likely,

```
but I certainly will recommend it. It makes good sense.
 1
 2
               MR. HERDMAN: I just want to point out the
 3
     government has agreed in the plea agreement that we will
 4
     not contest whatever requests by defense counsel with
 5
     respect to the location of the incarceration.
 6
               THE COURT: I assume the bond was discharged,
 7
     right?
 8
               MR. HERDMAN: It just was.
 9
               MR. GILBERT: It just was. And Judge, if you can
10
     put into the recommendation Oxford or an institution as
11
     close to Chicago --
12
               THE COURT: As close to Chicago as possible.
13
               MR. GILBERT: -- as possible.
14
               THE COURT:
                           Absolutely. I agree. I have no
     problem with that at all. The idea of sending somebody
15
     2,000, 3,000 miles away from his family makes no sense.
16
17
     But as I say, that's the Bureau of Prisons.
18
               Mr. Ahmed, although I assume that the plea
19
     agreement -- I know the plea agreement waives any right
20
     that you might otherwise have to appeal; nonetheless, I
21
     have to inform you that to the extent you may have a right
22
     to appeal in order to preserve and protect that right, you
23
     must file a notice of appeal within ten days of the entry
24
    by me, my judgment, which will occur sometime later today.
25
     If you fail to file a timely notice of appeal, you will
```

lose forever whatever rights you might otherwise have had 1 2 to challenge your conviction or sentence by way of direct 3 appeal, post conviction relief, habeas corpus or otherwise, 4 do you understand that? You do not. Okay. I can explain 5 The plea agreement -- the plea agreement if I --6 THE DEFENDANT: I understand, sir. 7 THE COURT: Counsel will tell me you have waived 8 the right to appeal except that does that include an 9 exception for imposing a sentence in excess of the 10 statutory maximum? 11 MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor, or outside the 12 agreed to --13 THE COURT: Outside -- so as a practical matter, 14 you probably, in all likelihood, do not have a right to 15 appeal; however, if you do, you must exercise that right 16 within ten days or you will lose it forever. 17 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 18 THE COURT: To pronounce my reasons under section 19 3553(A) and the guidelines, obviously extremely serious 20 The government has said it all in that regard. 21 believe that the sentence will promote respect for the law. 22 I believe that under all circumstances, the sentence is 23 just. It does take into account the cooperation and the 24 assistance that the defendant provided following his arrest

and charge in this case. I hope that it affords

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sufficiently adequate deterrent of you, Mr. Ahmed. As to that, only time will tell. And I certainly hope -- and part of the reason for my accepting the government's representation is to underscore public deterrent effect of the sentence, as I recall expressing, and although the circumstances here are somewhat different, but as I recall expressing at the time, I sentenced the other three defendants and what at one time was a case including you as well, people should be aware that if somebody shows up talking Jihad this and Jihad that, and encouraging people to engage in acts contrary to the interest and the welfare of this country and its citizens and its servicemen, the most sensible thing for anybody who hears that kind of statement and that sort of entreaty is to assume that that individual is working for the United States of America and is not as he purports to be. And unfortunately, Mr. Mazloum, Mr. Amawi and Mr. El-Hindi did not come to that conclusion. To some extent, you were exposed to the same thing with Mr. Griffin, and although the link that you had with him and the other three defendants never became a binding chain, nonetheless you did not end in entirely the intentions that took you to Egypt and were encouraged in the conversation that you had on that July 4th long ago. But it is my hope that this sentence, the final analysis serves as a deterrent to others who might be similarly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
The government takes that kind of conduct and
attention very seriously, as it has to. And to some
extent, I am seeking to have you serve as an example of
what happens when people thoughtlessly and foolishly get
caught up in the kinds of thinking that you did. I take
you at your word that you have abandoned those thoughts. I
hope so. Quite candidly, though, were it within my power
to do so, I would impose a much longer period of supervised
release so that there would be reason for us to be able to
ensure that that is the case, but I cannot. But that is my
sentence. Mr. Herdman, need I say or do anything else
before concluding the proceedings as to Mr. Zubair Ahmed?
         MR. HERDMAN: No, Your Honor. I'm satisfied with
that.
          THE COURT:
                    Mr. Gilbert?
         MR. GILBERT: Nothing further.
          THE COURT: That will conclude the proceedings as
to Mr. Zubair Ahmed. Mr. Herdman, with regard to
Mr. Khaleel Ahmed?
          MR. HERDMAN: Your Honor, with respect to Khaleel
Ahmed, at the outset I do need to make a motion under
section 5(K) of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines.
          THE COURT:
                    Time out. You also -- are there any
dismissals with regard to Mr. Zubair?
         MR. HERDMAN: Yes. I didn't know if you wanted
```

to do that. 1 2 THE COURT: Why don't we do it with regard 3 Mr. Zubair Ahmed. 4 MR. HERDMAN: With respect to Mr. Zubair Ahmed, 5 the indictment as it -- prior to the superseding 6 information that was filed, indictment as to Mr. Zubair 7 Ahmed has to be dismissed. THE COURT: A little louder. It's hard for me to 8 9 hear. 10 MR. HERDMAN: I'm sorry. The indictment as opposed to the superseding information to which Mr. Zubair 11 12 Ahmed has pled guilty, the indictment should be dismissed 13 at this time, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. GILBERT: No objection. 16 MR. HERDMAN: And as to Khaleel Ahmed, the 17 government does have two motions to make. The first being 18 under Section 5(K) of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines, and 19 in accordance with the plea agreement that's been entered 20 into by the parties, the government, at this point in time, 21 does move under Section 5(K) for a departure of 12 levels 2.2 to an offense level of 26. And the government would also 23 make a separate motion under the guidelines for acceptance 24 of responsibility with respect to this defendant. And that

should put us at an offense level of 23, criminal history

25

```
category six.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: And I think we previously agreed to
 3
     that.
 4
               MR. SLADE: Your Honor, that does accurately
 5
     state that in the plea agreement.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 7
               MR. HERDMAN: Now I'm not going to go back into
 8
     all --
 9
               THE COURT: Give me one second.
10
               MR. HERDMAN:
                             Sure.
11
               THE COURT: Go ahead. I'm sorry. I had to check
12
     something.
13
               MR. HERDMAN: I don't think I need to go back
14
     through all of the --
15
               THE COURT: I would agree.
16
               MR. HERDMAN: But, again, the nature and
17
     circumstances of the offense with respect to Khaleel Ahmed,
18
     it's the same offense we discussed with respect to Zubair.
19
     I just want to point out, though, although there was an
20
     enhancement for Zubair Ahmed in the leadership role he
21
     took, there's no mitigating factor with respect to Khaleel
22
     Ahmed for mitigating the offense.
               THE COURT: I understand.
23
24
               MR. HERDMAN: So I just wanted to point that out
25
     to The Court. And with respect to Khaleel Ahmed, he -- he
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was a lockstep partner, I would say, with Zubair Ahmed. It's true that Zubair was more communicative, I think is the way Mr. Gilbert put it; however, Khaleel Ahmed was also in line with Zubair Ahmed with respect to the ambition that they shared, with respect to planning that went into the trip to Egypt, with respect to the discussions at the July 4th ICNA conference, with respect to all of the communications with Syed Haris Ahmed. As I pointed out in the sentencing memorandum, I think it's very telling that there was a December telephone conversation between Syed Haris Ahmed and Zubair Ahmed at the conclusion of which Zubair Ahmed and Syed Haris Ahmed agreed that they would try to meet up down in Atlanta. And the first phone call that Zubair Ahmed made after he hung up with Zubair Ahmed was to his cousin Khaleel. And Khaleel knew who Syed Haris Ahmed was. He was willing to plan and go down to Atlanta. And in some respects, and this, again's, pointed out in the sentencing memorandum. In February 2006 there came a point in time where Zubair Ahmed complained that there were obstacles in their path with respect to the -- Jihad. Khaleel played a role of advising Zubair Ahmed that this was just another obstacle that's in their path that they have to overcome in order to achieve this objective. So in a lot of ways, it's -- this conspiracy is a conspiracy of equals, although there was a guideline enhancement for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Zubair Ahmed. They were close friends and relatives, and they were -- they shared the same intent. They shared the same objectives, and Khaleel Ahmed was there every step of the way in this conspiracy with Zubair. And Khaleel Ahmed, again, you've seen the materials that have been submitted by defense counsel, this is a person who had numerous opportunities. He held a variety of what appeared to be well-paying jobs, professional type jobs, and he was also pursuing an education. While all of this was going on, he still harbored this desire to go overseas and to kill United States military, to engage in violent Jihad overseas. Yes, it's true that this was one part of his life, but all of these other parts of his life and part of the five-year plan that the Ahmeds had conceived, was that their entire lives would be devoted to this objective. it's natural to conclude that the education, the financial stability that either one had enjoyed, a lot of steps that he was taking in his own personal life, all of those had, at least in the long-term, had some role to play in the defendant's conspiracy to kill members of the U.S. military overseas. And I should have said this at the outset, the government is respected -- with respect to Khaleel Ahmed a sentence of 108 months. And the offense that the defendants have already pled to reflects what Mr. Gilbert was trying to say is that this plan, I think I would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dispute the characterization of it not being serious or not being well thought out, but the street steps they were taking with regard to completion of this plan and the activities that the defendants engaged in, that they have pled to, all of that is reflected in the charge -- they're not pleading to the 956 conspiracy, they're pleading to the conspiracy to commit themselves to engaging in violent Jihad overseas. Khaleel and his attorneys have also tried to draw comparisons to Wassim Masloum and essentially saying that --THE COURT: I know. I understand. MR. HERDMAN: -- least culpable. THE COURT: Yep. MR. HERDMAN: All five defendants, and for the same reasons I outlined with respect to Mr. Zubair, I would just urge The Court to take a little more into -- with respect to those facts. But I don't feel a need to rehash all the circumstances of these defendants because these defendants engaged in the exact same conduct together. This was a series, as I said, of equals, and Khaleel Ahmed was, along with Zubair Ahmed, planning and perpetrating this conspiracy from a very early age and continued up until the moment of their arrest is the government's position. And for that reason, the government is

recommending a sentence of 108 months.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, MR. SLADE: there's no doubt and there's no dispute that in 2004 my client, Khaleel Ahmed, was a confused kid. He had been in the country just a few years. He had spent his whole life abroad. He had a couple of normal years as a young man. But his dad in 2002 had a stroke and Khaleel was forced to give up all of those educational opportunities. He had to go to work to support his family. And it was at that point in time that Khaleel got to know his cousin Zubair very well. Khaleel looked up to Zubair, Your Honor. He was older, he was a lot more familiar with the U.S. culture. He was a lot more familiar with the Islamic religion, and I think even the government would agree Zubair has a very gregarious big personality. My client's not like that, Your Honor. Khaleel is very shy. He looked up to Zubair. They spent a ton of time together. And it was in that context that my client made a trip to Egypt in 2004. And when he went, I agree with Mr. Gilbert, there's no doubt that in their minds they thought we'll go to Egypt and then we'll use it as a spring board to the battlefield in somewhere they didn't really know quite honestly. Now, Mr. Herdman says that but for Mr. El-Hindi and Mohammed Ahmed, there would have been something that would have mattered. I can't say that would have happened.

We'll never know, but let's look at the facts of what

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

happened. They were there two or three days before

Mohammed Ahmed and the El-Hindi brothers got there. What
happened during those two or three days? Absolutely
nothing. They were there a week after Mohammed Ahmed and
the El-Hindi brothers got there. If they really were
serious about this, something would have happened. What
happened, Your Honor? Nothing.

Now, it's clear that what they did when -- what they had in their minds when they went to Egypt was very serious, but I do not think the facts in any way support the government's argument that something serious was going to happen but for the intervention of the El-Hindi brothers and Mohammed -- Your Honor, when they came back to the United States in 2004 they were brought to Cleveland to the ICNA conference. And Your Honor saw the video many times. That was the only time they ever met Darren Griffin. evidence is undisputed that Khaleel, my client, completely blew off Darren Griffin. Griffin and Mr. El-Hindi made repeated attempts to get my client to join in his cell and my client said I'm too busy. He blew him off. And he had an opportunity, as Mr. Herdman said, to join with Mr. El-Hindi and his friends and my client said no. Your Honor, it is very serious what he did when he went to Egypt, but in all serious aspects, it ended there.

Your Honor, my client has no criminal history, no

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
history of any violence at all. And Your Honor, my client
was out on pretrial release for more than two years and
Your Honor didn't hear a single peep from him. There were
no violations whatsoever. My client accepted
responsibility, and he surrendered early. Khaleel has now
served 17 months in a maximum security facility. He
surrendered early to get his sentence started.
                     Where is he serving his sentence?
          THE COURT:
          MR. SLADE: The MCC of Chicago, they have to be
max because he -- and he knew if he was going to surrender
early to get the clock started, he knew he was going have
to serve harder time than he otherwise would.
          THE COURT:
                     Is that a permanent place of
designation?
          MR. SLADE: No, typically it's pretrial.
          THE COURT:
                     Awaiting sentence.
          MR. SLADE:
                     I've got some clients who serve the
whole time here, but those have been --
                     Sure. So, Your Honor, my client
          THE COURT:
accepted responsibility. He pled guilty and he surrendered
early because he wants to get this done. He does not have
these ambitions anymore, and he wants to move on with his
life.
          MR. SLADE: Your Honor, I want to discuss for a
moment, because I think it's really important, the needs of
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what unwanted sentencing disparities, and I completely disagree with the government's analysis and analogies of this case to the Masloum situation. Giving my client more time than Mr. Masloum would make absolutely no sense for four reasons.

The first reason is, Your Honor, by definition, Mr. Ahmed's crime, Khaleel Ahmed's crime, is less serious than Mr. Masloum's crime. Mr. Herdman said it himself, what Mr. Masloum was convicted of by a jury of was conspiracy to kill or maim Americans abroad in violation of 18 U.S.C. 956(A). What Khaleel pled guilty to was a less serious crime, conspiracy to provide material support for terrorists, violation of 18 U.S.C. 2335(A). There's no doubt it's a less serious offense, congress says it's less serious. The maximum penalty for each is less. And Your Honor said it was less serious. In the Amawi case, as you recall, they were all convicted of both charges, both 956(A) and 8, but when Your Honor added up the sentencing, you gave less time on Count 2 then you would have for Count A. By definition, what Mr. Khaleel Ahmed did was less serious than Mr. Masloum, and Mr. Masloum got 100 months. It doesn't make sense for Khaleel to get more.

The second reason is, Your Honor, I'm kind of surprised at the government's assertion that what Mr. Ahmed did was more serious than Mr. Masloum because they took the

opposite position in their briefing before The Court before the Masloum sentencing. In that they said things like Mr. Masloum repeatedly asserted himself by offering money, recommending recruits and providing training suggestions, none of that's true of Mr. Khaleel. They said that Masloum implored Mr. Griffin to accelerate the Jihad training. That's not true of my client. But the reality is, my client, what he did is significantly less serious than what Mr. Masloum was convicted of by a jury.

The third reason that he needs to get less time than Mr. Masloum is just because of the -- it's one simple fact that nobody can dispute, Mr. Griffin recruited Mr. Masloum into a cell. He asked Mr. Masloum do you want to join my Jihadist cell, Mr. Mazloum said yes. He asked my client the same question. Do you want to joint my terrorist cell, and Khaleel said no. There's no basis to sentence Mr. Khaleel to more time than Mazloum.

And the fourth reason, I don't want this to go unnoticed and I kind of fear it is. Mr. Masloum forced the government to put on a three-month trial. He didn't accept responsibility, and he's still -- and he's appealing. He still hasn't accepted responsibility. My client, Khaleel Ahmed, is sorry for what he did. He wants to pay his debts to society for what he did. He pled guilty, accepted responsibility and then cooperated with the government. It

is unbelievably difficult for these guys to cooperate with the government and potentially have to testify as convicted -- as folks convicted of terrorist-related crime. They agreed to do it. And that is something that completely diverges my client's situation from Mr. Masloum, completely.

Mr. Khaleel did, I also don't agree with the characterization that he was lock-stepped with his cousin the entire time. The evidence doesn't support that at all.

Now, I agree with what Mr. Herdman said they had the same intent when they went to Egypt, they did. They planned together and went to Egypt together. But my client never spoke to Syed Haris. He actually -- my client, I think the evidence is, he had one conversation with Syed Haris Ahmed about computer mother boards.

THE COURT: Computer?

MR. SLADE: My client never had any conversations with Syed Haris about Jihad. There's a ton of instant messages and e-mails with Zubair and Syed. That's not true of Khaleel at all. Khaleel never met Syed Haris Ahmed. So a lot -- pretty much -- I mean everything that happened, there are a few events the government's talking about, a few sporadic contacts, but virtually everything after Egypt with -- we're asking for a period of 92 months. I think it's hard to justify a longer sentence. There's no way

under all these circumstances that he should get the same or more than Mr. Masloum did, and I think a sentence of 92 months is more than sufficient to punish him for what he did, to deter him or others from doing it again, to protect the public and rehabilitate him.

As far as protecting the public, Your Honor -Your Honor remembers we had two contested bond hearings
when Mr. Khaleel was arrested in February. He came here in
April of 2007. And the government argued that Khaleel was
a flight risk and a danger to the community, and Your Honor
disagreed, and he was out on bond.

In December of 2007, the government arrested him again, and we came back here again and had another contested bond hearing. Now, this was not because of anything that Khaleel got wrong because he had been acting like a choir boy while he was on pretrial release. The government's new allegations in the superseding indictment were so serious that it increased his flight risk. Your Honor, this again, disagreed. He was out on bond for two years. He did nothing wrong. He surrendered early because what my client wants to do is apologize to everyone, pay his debt to society and get back to his family who desperately needs him.

Your Honor, we're asking for a sentence of 92 months, and I'll be able to answer any questions you have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Herdman, do you want to respond? MR. HERDMAN: I do. With respect to the analogizing where I tried to de-analogize, I suppose, I don't even know if that's a word, but to Wassim Masloum. Just to respond, my point, when Mr. Slade says that the offense that the defendant has pled to is less serious than 956, all he's talking about is the maximum statutory penalties that's available, and that's just one consideration there. When we talk about the severity of the offense, the statutory offense that defendant has pled to. But obviously there's more than The Court has to consider than just the --THE COURT: Well, it seems to me the conduct that he engaged in along with his cousin extinguishes him from Mr. Masloum and his conduct. MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor. And that's the same point I tried to make with Zubair Ahmed. That's the problem I have, quite THE COURT: candidly. To some extent they're quite similar. He got --I believe your client, in a sense, got deeper in, took more steps both literally and figuratively. He talked less perhaps, or hardly at all, and certainly what happened after the Cleveland encounter, after he returned from Egypt, there was a distance, in fact, if not almost a form

of separation. But if I recall quite distinctly, there was

2.2

one contact between your client and Mr. Syed Haris Ahmed, and he basically turned his back on whatever was coming from Toledo to Chicago to reel him back in. I understand that.

MR. SLADE: I agree that Mr. Masloum did not go to Egypt. I also agree Mr. Masloum did not say no when Griffin asked him to join the terrorist cell. My client did. And I think, Your Honor, congress has said which defense is more serious in terms of setting the maximum offense level, the sentencing commission said the same thing in the guidelines, and that's my argument, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand. Go ahead, Mr. Herdman.

MR. HERDMAN: And the point Mr. Slade's made and he made earlier goes to the heart of what we're talking about here which is, in fact, Khaleel Ahmed may not have joined a cell that was proposed by Darren Griffin because he already had a cell with his cousin Zubair Ahmed, and that cell, before he ever had contact with Darren Griffin and it existed after he had contact with Darren Griffin, and that goes to the heart of what this case is about, Your Honor. These two defendants trusted each other completely because of their relationship and their friendship. And in some sense that puts us in an entirely different -- it's not even similar on that level as if we're trying to draw

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

similarities factually between Wassim Masloum and Khaleel Ahmed. I think it collapses in the weight of the facts in this case because they're different. You can't get to where defense counsel wants us to get by trying to analogize the behavior here. And it does fall center around Darren Griffin. And I would say that these defendants had their own cell already. They didn't need Darren Griffin to advance what they were trying to do, and that's the point that stuck out to me the most that Mr. Slade --THE COURT: Mr. Slade, anything further before I call upon your client? MR. SLADE: I think the arguments are on the table. THE COURT: Mr. Ahmed, you have the right to speak on your own behalf before I proceed to announce sentence. KHALEEL AHMED: Yes, Your Honor. In contrast of my cousin, first of all, I want to thank you for giving me a chance to talk. I'm in contrast with my cousin, I'm a quiet person so I'm not comfortable enough to speak as lengthy as my cousin. But after expressing these few words, I hope you make a relevant decision, it will make a difference in the decision. The steps I took to pursue something from my misguided interest lead to a

misapprehension of my personality. I'm not a violent person, and I don't have any violent plans. I've never hurt anyone in my whole life, and because of that -- because of that behavior, I pled guilty and I accepted responsibility. I feel remorseful pretty much to everything. I want to apologize to the government, mostly my family, especially to you. And while I'm in custody with the Federal Bureau of Prisons, you know, I plan on becoming -- I mean being productive to whatever programs they have to offer. And though I can't change my past, but as a changed person I believe -- I believe the actions I've taken were completely wrong, and it's a violent crime, and as a changed person, I feel more apologetic to -- for what I've done. And in regards to that, pretty much I leave the decision on Your Honor and hope for the best.

THE COURT: I'm going to impose a term of 100 months, less than the government has requested, more than the defendant's attorney very eloquently has asked me to impose obviously. I will express my reasons for doing so in a moment.

Formally to pronounce sentence, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, 18 U.S. Code, Section 3553(A), it's the judgment of this court that Khaleel Ahmed be and hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons be in prison for a term of 100 months. I neglected

2.2

to mention with regard to his cousin, I will acknowledge to both, it's my recommendation, I believe in any event it's a law that they both get credit for the time previously served.

Upon release from imprisonment, defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. Within 72 hours release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, he shall report in person to the United States pretrial and probation office in this district or in the district to which he is released. No fine will be imposed and all restitution obligations, does have to pay a special assessment of \$100, hopefully if not paid will be withdrawn from any prison earnings.

While on supervised release, defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, shall not illegally possess controlled substances and shall comply with all the standard conditions adopted by this court and with the following additional conditions. There's no drug abuse background right, Mr. Slade?

MR. SLADE: Your Honor, That's right. I actually forgot one thing. I wanted to make the same request as Mr. Gilbert for him serving confinement in one of two facilities either Oxford or Terre Haute, Indiana, both of them have medium security facilities, I think it would be appropriate for Khaleel also --

```
THE COURT: I'm checking with the deputy.
 1
 2
     don't think that they can is the problem with their
 3
     criminal history category.
 4
               U.S. MARSHALL: It's my understanding the Bureau
 5
     of Prisons, due to the terrorism enhancement, initially
 6
     they will go to a maximum security facility until they
 7
     reclassify further on down the road. That's my best
     understanding how the BOP's been going lately.
 8
 9
               THE COURT:
                           I certainly will recommend it because
10
     it candidly --
11
               MR. SLADE: I think we all understand, Your
12
     Honor.
13
               THE COURT: One looks past the labels and says,
14
     wait a minute, what kind of custodial circumstances are
15
     needed or best suited here, and that is not my call, but I
16
     will make that recommendation. I always think that it's
17
     important, particularly when defendants as these two
18
     defendants so clearly do, have family who are anxious to be
19
     as supportive as they can. That's crucial to anybody who's
20
     confined, just a matter of common decency, and yet the
21
     Bureau of Prisons has its own criteria and requirements,
22
     and all I can do is recommend, which I will.
23
               MR. SLADE: We appreciate Your Honor's help.
24
     Thank you.
25
               THE COURT: In any event, I will not impose the
```

2.2

drug testing requirement. Defendant shall not possess a firearm, destructive device, dangerous weapon. While on supervised release, you shall submit yourself and your residence, place of business, computer, vehicle to a warrantless search conducted and controlled by the U.S. probation office at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based on reasonable suspicion that he's in possession of contraband or evidence of violation of supervised release. Failure to submit to such a search will be grounds for revocation. Defendant shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

He shall provide the probation officer with any and all requested financial information.

While on supervised release he shall diligently seek to obtain, and if he obtains, diligently seek to maintain lawful gainful employment.

He shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

Let me tell both the defendants because it's my custom to do so, you can never again lawfully possess a firearm. To do so would be a very serious federal offense, and if you are found in possession of a firearm, particularly in light of this conviction, I have no doubt that you will be prosecuted under the applicable federal

```
statute and receive a term of the maximum of which at
 1
 2
     present I believe is 10 years; is that correct?
 3
               MR. HERDMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT:
                          So does any party have any objections
 5
     to any part of these proceedings not previously made?
 6
               MR. HERDMAN: Not for the government.
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Slade?
 8
               MR. SLADE: None, Your Honor.
 9
               MR. GILBERT: No, Your Honor, we have one
10
     request, though.
11
               THE COURT: Let me finish up and then I'll get --
     I'll come back to that, Mr. Gilbert.
12
13
               MR. SLADE: Your Honor, I think we'd like to get
     the indictment dismissed.
14
15
               THE COURT: That was the next stage.
16
               MR. HERDMAN: Okay. You know, I may have missed
17
     this, Your Honor, but with respect to your finding as to
18
     Khaleel Ahmed, are they based on the same findings that you
19
     gave for Zubair Ahmed, obviously different defendant taking
20
     into account his circumstances?
21
               THE COURT: I will get into that.
22
               MR. HERDMAN: Okay. And now I'm comfortable
23
     dismissing the indictment with respect to Khaleel Ahmed as
24
     well.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ahmed, as I undertook to
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

explain to your cousin, and I realize it seems kind of odd, but I do have to notify you, you may have a right to appeal, although you've given up your right to appeal in the plea agreement. In any event, if you have a right to appeal, you must exercise that right within ten days of the entry of me by my written judgment, which will occur sometime today or tomorrow. And if you have such right and you fail to file timely notice of appeal, you will lose forever whatever right you might have to challenge your conviction or your sentence. Do you understand? KHALEEL AHMED: Yes, Your Honor. PROBATION: You waived the fine? THE COURT: And the bond has been discharged already? MR. SLADE: As to Khaleel, that's true, Your Honor. THE COURT: Let me say, well, first of all, in terms of the consideration of the factors under 3553(A) and the guidelines, I think I've already made clear my view about the seriousness of the offense, and even though the ultimate attempt was not accomplished, nonetheless, taking the steps that were taken in this case constitute a very serious violation of our law. I hope that I note that these sentences promote respect for the law. I believe that the sentence is just on the whole.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Slade, I want you to know that I've listened very carefully to your comments and have taken them into consideration. The fact that they've had a favorable effect on your client's ultimate sentence, if perhaps not though, perhaps not the effect you had hoped to achieve. I am, quite candidly, more confident that with regard to Khaleel Ahmed that the deterrent individual -- deterrent effect for this entire experience and this sentence have already been accomplished. On the other hand, I think that a fundamental importance that the public deterrent effect be implemented, and that the people simply come to know that engaging in this kind of conduct and this kind of activity in taking steps, whatever they may be, steps having been taken by Mr. Amawi and Mr. Masloum or Mr. El-Hindi or the steps you took and your cousin took, they may seem but modest. They may not have much realistic hope of accomplishment. Nonetheless, given the underlying intent and objective, they should be and will be certainly, by this Court, dealt with most severely, and ultimately in the hope that others learn from this example, and whatever they may think that they simply do not act in any way whatsoever in furtherance of those thoughts.

I believe that the sentence protects the public as I believe and hope the one that I impose on Mr. Zubair Ahmed does.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I want to say something, quite candidly. I had come into this anticipating the likelihood of imposing the maximum term under the guidelines. I take note, as I hope the defendants do, of the government's having moved away from that, and having recommended to me a sentence less than what it might have sought and might have recommended, which, quite candidly, I anticipated it would recommend. And I think that the government is to be commended that at the end of the day when all of these cases and all of these proceedings have come to an end, that it was willing to enter into plea negotiations that I suspect was difficult for it as they were for the Mr. Zubair Ahmed and Mr. Khaleel Ahmed. Nonetheless, that on behalf of the United States, the United States Attorney's Office and Department of Justice were willing to make a modest gesture of leniency. And I find that to be entirely appropriate. Anything further for the government? MR. HERDMAN: No, Judge. THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert? MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, with all due respect and I say this sincerely, I ask you to reconsider the 120 months for Zubair. I just don't see why there should be a 20 month difference between the two cousins, and particularly because he was assigned a one-point enhancement. And the government has always maintained, and

they just said earlier that the only difference between the two individuals is that he was more communicative.

THE COURT: Well, he also, Mr. Gilbert, and if I'm wrong, tell me, because it plays a considerable role, was quite actively engaged in the communications with Mr. Syed Haris Ahmed. I realize that he may have played a role in that individual's ultimate conviction, but if I read the presentence report correctly, and again, if I did not, tell me, Mr. Syed Haris Ahmed, of all the people with any connection with these defendants or indeed with the other three who are before me, and of course he had none with them. But nonetheless, he was committed, and he was abroad literally undertaking to further the aims and objectives that your client and he were discussing.

MR. GILBERT: Judge, what they did was just communicate with each other, there was no plan between the two of them. In fact, Mr. Haris encouraged him to come to meet him in Georgia, and he never did that. I mean, to -- I just don't see how you can justify not giving at least some consideration to the fact that two of these guys were in this together. I mean, we already had given Zubair --

THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert, rightly or wrongly, I take from the presentence report and what I know about their conduct. The conclusion that your client was more actively involved and more thoroughly committed and played

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a role of some influence, if not significant influence, vis-a-vis of his cousin. He was older, he was, I think, according to my understanding, more dedicated to his religious beliefs and principals, and I find that his culpability is more significant. MR. GILBERT: But there's no evidence of that. THE COURT: Pardon? MR. GILBERT: I don't think there's any evidence of what you just said. I don't think the government is saying that he induced his cousin to join. THE COURT: I think he played an influential role. That's my understanding and impression. MR. HERDMAN: And Your Honor, best evidence of this, the fact that defendant accepted his plea agreement with the two-level enhancement for assuming a leadership rope in this conspiracy. And that should end this argument. MR. GILBERT: One level. MR. HERDMAN: No, it was two levels. And the defendant got an additional level in terms of his cooperation. And quite frankly, that was because he was able to provide --MR. GILBERT: So why doesn't that take care of the issues that we're talking about? Why doesn't the role enhancement be sufficient to take into account the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
differences between these two individuals? When in the
same breath the government gets up there and says that they
were lockstep and the whole process from day one. I mean,
I just -- I'm sorry, I just don't get that defense.
          THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert, I tried to express
myself as best I can.
          MR. GILBERT: And the other thing I want to
say --
          THE COURT: And if you find that there is no
basis in the record, I quess you can't -- you can't appeal.
I candidly wish you could because I would be perfectly
content to have you take the reasons that I've expressed
down to Cincinnati and say Judge Carr was wrong. He didn't
have the basis for the distinction that he drew and the
difference in the sentence. To repeat, it is my impression
and my finding that your client was more culpable both in
terms of his commitment, in terms of his relationship with
his cousin and in terms of the activities that he undertook
with Syed Haris Ahmed. And again, he was the one directly
in contact with Mr. Syed Haris Ahmed who himself was, as I
understand it, abroad literally in various places in this
country and Canada as well; is that correct, Mr. Herdman?
          MR. HERDMAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
          THE COURT: Syed Haris Ahmed was also active in
Canada?
```

MR. HERDMAN: He traveled to Canada. 1 2 THE COURT: That's what I mean by --3 MR. HERDMAN: Yes. 4 THE COURT: And the understanding that I have is 5 that those travels and that activity was in furtherance 6 ultimately of objectives that, of the same sort, that bring your client and his cousin here today. If I'm wrong about 7 that, tell me. 8 9 MR. GILBERT: Well, I think, well, to a respect 10 you're wrong. The activities of Syed Haris going to 11 Pakistan and going to Canada had absolutely nothing to do with Zubair. They were not even talking about that. 12 THE COURT: 13 I know they were not talking about 14 it. But on the other hand, that's what Mr. Syed Haris 15 Ahmed was about, and I don't suggest that there's a 16 conspiracy or whatever, but the fire with which your client 17 was playing in his contacts and communication and 18 electronic correspondence with Syed Haris Ahmed ultimately 19 was far more dangerous. 20 Part of what I'm trying to do is to send a 21 message, somebody starts talking Jihad this and Jihad that, 22 walk, do not run -- run, do not walk away from that 23 individual. Your client did not. And I'm trying to tell 24 anybody else who may be inclined or have the opportunity or

be induced or sucked into that kind of conversation has to

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

understand it has consequences. That ultimately is what I'm trying to accomplish by making an example of your client. The same thing I was trying to do with the Amawi, Masloum and El-Hindi conversation. Steve Hartman was absolutely correct, take Darren Griffin out of that case and there is no case. Those three people hardly knew each other before he put them together and put them into prison. And anybody out there who hears that kind of talk from anybody else should run away if they don't want to find yourselves where your client, Mr. Slade's client, and the other three defendants in this case now find themselves. That's the message I'm trying to send. It may not be heard. It may not be effective. It may not be publicized by the government. Lord knows I looked in vain at the press reports in my last sentencing that somebody somewhere would have picked that up, but they didn't. Fox News, I'm told, I don't get cable, spent much of that trial with leading the story, about with pictures of the twin towers burning, terror in Toledo, but when the time comes for the news media to pick up on what really happens in these cases, where are they? But that's all I can do. Your client persisted in engaging in communications that ultimately, had he not been caught, captured and confined and had Mr. Syed Haris not been captured caught and confined, could have led to the fulfillment of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

objectives that took them to Egypt. Now, that may not seem to make sense to you, but ultimately what this case and these sentences are trying to accomplish is to make clear to anybody who in any way has it in his or her mind to engage in acts of terrorism against the citizens or soldiers of the United States of America, ought to understand the dangers of following up on that. You can think what you want about this country, and I think a lot of things are probably not particularly popular about what we're doing in the Middle East and Afghanistan, but I'm entitled to think so, but I cannot follow up on that without putting myself at the risk that has led these clients here. That is why I imposed the sentence I did on your client. He kept in communication, he kept in correspondence. He kept thinking about it. He abandoned his dedication to it only upon being arrested. I believe that Khaleel, his cousin, literally walked away from that sooner and more thoroughly, as did Mr. Masloum. That's the bottom line as to why your client got the additional time to be an example. Somebody comes to you -- I'll say it for the third and last time -- talking about Jihad this and Jihad that and Jihad the other thing and doing the kinds of things that all five of these defendants did or talked about doing, beware. Watch out. Because if you start taking steps, no matter how small, in no absolute terms how

```
significant they are, I can't remember who it was that went
 1
 2
     out to the firing range, Clelands in the other case, that's
 3
     it. Masloum buys the paintball gun, that's the heaviest of
 4
     the armament among the three of them and look what
 5
     happened. And that's the message I'm trying to send.
 6
     Whether it's even broadcast literally or figuratively or
 7
     not. That's all I can do as a Judge. That's what
 8
     deterrence, public deterrence is all about, is to warn
 9
     people, do this and that's what can happen.
10
               Mr. Herdman, anything further from the
11
     government?
12
               MR. HERDMAN: No, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert?
14
               MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, I was wondering if my
     client could have an opportunity to speak with his family?
15
16
               THE COURT:
                           It's normally my practice to let that
17
    happen if it's agreeable with the marshals.
18
               U.S. MARSHALL: For a short amount of time, Your
19
     Honor, but no personal contact.
20
               THE COURT: Yeah, whatever they are willing to
21
     permit you to do. That will conclude these proceedings.
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
4	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
5	
6	s:/Angela D. Nixon
7	
8	Angela D. Nixon, RPR, CRR Date
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	